

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/440,829	CHENCHIK ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	BJ Forman	1634	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) BJ Forman. (3) _____.

(2) Kathleen DalBon. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 17 October 2002.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: all.

Identification of prior art discussed: Brown, Sheiness & Ebersole.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.


Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview(if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.



Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The examiner stated numerous concerns regarding the claims in view of the prior art. 1. the declaration is not commensurate in scope with the claimed invention i.e. the claims are drawn to any support and any oligo with or without a label while the declaration address the examples in the Specification which teach a glass support and radio-labeled oligos. 2. any subsequent declaration should address the limitations currently claimed. 3. the teaching in the prior art clearly demonstrates that immobilized oligos of over 50 nt were known (see Brown). 4. a declaration illustrating the "blip" in hybridization efficiency and unexpected results would be considered and it was recommended that oligos of at least 3 different lengths above and below the claimed range may illustrate the unexpected results for the claimed range. 5. it was recommended that the claims be limited to the inventive concept which provides the unexpected results e.g. glass support, 60-100 nt length and label. 6. a limitation of "about 60" would be encompassed by the 57-mer of Ebersole. 6. it was suggested that if the specification does not teach a label other than radioactive, the claims should be limited to the labels which provide the unexpected results. .